

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
ANDERSON/GREENWOOD DIVISION

Ray Edward Wells, #133275,	)	Civil Action No. 8:07-600-CMC-BHH
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	<b><u>REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION</u></b>
	)	<b><u>OF MAGISTRATE JUDGE</u></b>
Dr. Sampson, MD, MCI, SCDC; Doris	)	
Jacques, RN, HCA, MCI, SCDC;	)	
Raymond Reed, Jr., Warden, MCI,	)	
SCDC,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	

The plaintiff is proceeding in this action *pro se*. He is seeking relief pursuant to Title 42, United States Code, Section 1983, the United States Constitution, and various state-law claims. The plaintiff filed a motion for “relief” and for “judgment as a matter of law” on May 11, 2007. [Doc. 12.] The Court construes the motion as one for summary judgment. Upon review of that motion, the Court finds that the plaintiff has not met his burden under Fed. R. Civ. P. 56 to produce admissible evidence demonstrating that no genuine issues of fact remain.

The plaintiff has also filed a motion for “special damages.” [Doc. 17.] This is not a cognizable motion. Nor does it appear to be an attempt to amend his Complaint to plead special damages in this case. To the extent it is a request for the Court to enter judgment in his favor, it has been considered in conjunction with Doc. 12 and should be denied for the same reasons stated above.

It is, therefore, recommended that the plaintiff’s motions for “relief,” “judgment as a

matter of law,” and “special damages” [Docs. 12 &17] should be DENIED.

s/Bruce H. Hendricks  
United States Magistrate Judge

August 30, 2007  
Greenville, South Carolina